

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 10-23, 25, and 27-30 and objection to claims 3-9, 24, and 26 is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Initially, the Examiner objected to claims 10-23, and 27-29 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. Applicant has amended claims 10, 15, 16, 23, and 27-29 to refer to other claims in the alternative only and not to depend from any other multiple dependent claim. Additionally, Applicant has amended claims 14 and 22 to omit all multiple dependent claim language. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments overcome the objections under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c), and therefore respectfully requests removal of same.

The Examiner rejected claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. In response, Applicant has cancelled claim 30 from the application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by WO 03/038788 to Meijer ("Meijer"). Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite an apparatus where each second rotating element "is rotatable independently of, and non-synchronously with, all the other second rotating elements." Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 as amended is patentably distinguishable over the relied on art. For example, Meijer discloses prisms that are moved simultaneously and in co-operation with one another by a drive means, so one complete display changes into another complete display in one movement. Furthermore, as all prisms are connected by gears, movement of one will necessarily move all of the others. See Meijer, page 5, lines 1-5. Therefore, Meijer does not disclose or suggest

all the features found in claim 1 and does not anticipate that claim. Applicant further submits that claim 25 constitutes allowable subject matter, since it depends directly from claim 1.

The Examiner has acknowledged that claim 2 is allowable at this time, and further has acknowledged that claims 3-9, 24, and 26 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As claims 3-9, 24, and 26 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that any objection to these claims be removed.

In addition to the above referenced amendments, Applicant has amended various claims to better conform the claims to U.S. practice. For example, Applicant has added the feature of "at least two sides" to the first and second rotating elements recited in claim 2. In so amending the claims, the scope of the claims has not been increased and no new matter has been added.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: March 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Taylor P. Evans
Taylor P. Evans
Registration No.: 60,506
LERNER, DAVID, LITTBENBERG,
KRMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

858236_1.DOC